

A regular scheduled meeting of the **Planning Commission** was held on Thursday, August 6, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, at 500 Poplar View Parkway.

Staff members present were: Town Attorney, Mr. Nathan Bicks (via telephone); Development Director, Mr. Jay Cravens; Town Planner, Mr. Jaime Groce; Assistant Town Planner, Mrs. Nancy Boatwright; Town Planners, Ms. Don Singleton and Mr. Scott Henninger; Engineer, Mr. Dale Perryman; Deputy Town Engineer, Mr. Tom Flanagan; Fire Marshal, Mr. Paul Witt; Administrative Specialist, Sr., Mrs. Shari Michael.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Cotton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call to establish a Quorum

Cotton – present, Rozanski – present, Marshall – present, Gilbert – absent, Jordan – absent, Goddard – present, Johnson – present, Worley – present, Given – present.

Quorum Present.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Cotton asked if there were any additions or deletions to the minutes from the July 7, 2020 meeting.

Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the minutes from the July 7, 2020 meeting as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson, and seconded, to approve the July 7, 2020 minutes as presented.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll call:

Rozanski – yes, Given – yes, Marshall – yes, Johnson – yes, Goddard – yes, Worley – yes, Cotton - yes.

Motion Approved.

Approval of Agenda

Chairman Cotton asked if there were any additions or deletions to the Agenda.

Mr. Groce explained that the agenda is as published; however, item 7.b. DD20-004 – Schilling Farms PD, Area 2, Phase 66, The Water Tower District, Phase 1, had some miss-advertised numbers. There are 256 dwelling units in lieu of the published 258, and the acreage is 16.29, in lieu of the published 15.01 acres.

Vice-Chairman Rozanski asked about the actual file number of item 7.e. Georgetown PD, (FKA Mt. Pleasant Trace PD) as the agenda shows that the number is DD19-066, but the staff report shows it as DD19-093.

Mrs. Michael explained that the file shows it to be DD19-066. Staff will correct the staff report to show this number.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Cotton called for a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the agenda as amended.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll call:

Rozanski – yes, Johnson – yes, Given – yes, Marshall – yes, Goddard – yes, Worley – yes, Cotton - yes.

Motion Approved.

Consent Agenda:

Chairman Cotton asked if there was any discussion from the commissioners.

Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

DD20-056 – Rolling Meadows PD, Phase 3D - Request approval of Final Subdivision Plat for 14 single family lots on 9.920 acres located east of the terminus of Mountain Side Drive and at the south end of Grant Park Cove.

EXHIBITS	
1.	Conditions of Approval (7/17/20)
2.	Applicant’s cover letter (received 6/15/20)
3.	Engineering checklist for plat recording
4.	Final Subdivision Plat, received (6/15/20)

To approve the Final Subdivision Plat for Rolling Meadows PD, Phase 3D, which includes 14 single family dwellings on 9.920 acres located east of the current terminus of Mountain Side Drive and at the south end of Grant Park Cove (per Exhibit 4), subject to the conditions in Exhibit 1:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1) This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
- 2) The following revisions shall be made to the Final Plat prior to recording:
 - a) The minimum F.F.E.s must be provided and will be reviewed once the As-Built topo is submitted.
 - b) Suggest making the east line of the 150’ Drainage Easement a dashed line type like the other Drainage Easements to avoid any confusion. Revise the plat as needed.
 - c) Note #3 – Correct the spelling of “Next”.
 - d) Lot #183 – You have “Pedestrial” instead of “Pedestrian”, correct the spelling.
 - e) Is lot #171 still owned by Regency? If not, please add an Owner’s and Notary’s Certificate for the new owner. Will also need to add a Mortgagee and Notary’s Certificate if there is one.
 - f) Note #14 – Need to add C.O.S. 1.
 - g) Title Block – The description should match on all sheets.
 - h) Sheet #2 doesn’t really need to be a part of the plat. Please just submit it as a separate exhibit. Even though it will be a separate exhibit, the street names should match the names shown on the plat.
 - i) Sheet #3 – Title Block – Remove “Conditions” after Final Plat.
 - j) Planning Commission Certificate – Correct the spelling of “Any”.

DD20-062 - Anderson Subdivision – Request approval of a Final Subdivision Plat for a 3-lot residential subdivision on 0.89 acres located at 414 South Center Street.

To approve the Anderson Final Subdivision Plat for 3 lots on 0.89 acres located at 414 South Center Street subject to the conditions in Exhibit 4.

EXHIBITS	
1.	Applicant’s cover letter (7/1/2020)
2.	Final Subdivision Plat (7/1/2020)
3.	Engineering Checklist for Plat Recording
4.	PC Conditions of Approval (7/31/2020)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
2. Remove “Sheet No. 5 of 9” from Sheet 1.
3. Remove “Sheet No. 6 of 9” from Sheet 2.
4. Complete the applicant information in the date table.
5. Remove the existing accessory structures on Lot #3 from the plat.
6. Remove the accessory structures on Lot 3 that would violate the required building setback for accessory structures before the Final Subdivision Plat is recorded.
7. Title Block – Provide a more current date.
8. Title Block – The Engineering Firm information needs to be added back.
9. Ensure that everything is shown correctly and clearly on the resubmittal. Some of the lines on the Final Plat appear to be shifted/broken in the drawing.
10. Graphic Scale is not to scale.
11. Drawing is not to scale.
12. Provide a more current date for Note #1.
13. Add the following note: “All side and rear yard swales are to act as drainage ways. These swales are private and are to be maintained by the homeowner.”
14. Add the appropriate notes and certificates if there are covenant and restrictions.
15. Correct the Owner’s Notary Certificate (incorrect certificate).
16. Change the date of the Notary Certificates from 2019 to 2020.

Motion by Alderman Worley, and seconded, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll call:

Johnson – yes, Rozanski – yes, Given – yes, Marshall – yes, Goddard – yes, Worley – yes, Cotton - yes.

Motion Approved.

There was a brief discussion regarding the public speaker cards that Chairman Cotton has received for several items on tonight’s agenda.

Formal Agenda:

DD20-005 – Schilling Farms Planned Development Areas 2 & 12, Phase 65 – Request approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat for 3 commercial lots and 3 future development tracts on 53.78 acres on the west side of Schilling Boulevard West, south of Poplar Avenue.

EXHIBITS

1. PC Conditions of Approval (7/31/20)
2. Applicant’s Cover Letter (7/14/20)
3. Schilling Farms Phase 60 Traffic Impact Study Executive Summary (12/10/18)
4. Schilling Farms PD, Phase 66 Storm Water Drainage Summary
5. Preliminary Subdivision Plat (7/15/20)
6. Handout from applicant about road improvements.

DD20-004 – Schilling Farms Planned Development Area 2, Phase 66 (The Water Tower District, Phase 1) – Request approval of a Preliminary Site Plan for 256 multifamily residential units and 2,193 square feet of nonresidential development on 16.29 acres on the west side of Schilling Boulevard West, south of Poplar Avenue.

Mrs. Nancy Boatwright gave the staff presentation. She explained that there are 53.78 acres in Phase 65, with 3 commercial lots and 3 future development tracts. Lot 1 will be 2.87-acre commercial lot known as Phase 60. Lot 2 will be 16.29 acres and allow for the creation of The Water Tower District, Phase 1 with 256 rental dwelling units and 28 buildings. Lot 3 will be a 6.913-acre office lot known as Phase 67 and will allow for the building of IMC Headquarters.

She showed a colored rendering of the site plan for the development. The Schilling Farms PD allows a wide variety of uses and multi-family is allowed by the planned development. To date, 1,180 stand along apartment units have been approved and built in Schilling Farms, with 545 remaining. If the 256 units are approved, there will be 289 remaining in the PD. There are 2,592 standalone apartment units in the Town. Based on previous development approval and existing zoning, 726 standalone apartment units could be built in the Town, outside of the downtown area, and that includes the remaining 289 units in Schilling Farms, if this Phase for The Water Tower District is approved.

Multi-family dwelling units are allowed by right in Schilling Farms PD, Area 2 if organized in a Traditional Neighborhood pattern. This design will include mixed uses, buildings greater than 1 story, built close to the street, high level of architectural detail, modified street grid, pedestrian oriented, appropriate window glazing, street trees, streetlights and furniture, and limited perimeter block length.

The project is permitted to develop as a unified development with two or more lots to be combined with bulk requirements determined by the perimeter lot line of all of Area 2. The PD allows a maximum density of 15 units per acre. The density for the first phase will be 2.8 DUA with the total of 545 units when Phase 2 is developed, the density would be 5.97 DUA. Setbacks allow eight feet from the private street, five feet from the service drive or alley, three feet from the side yard with no less than five feet between buildings, and balconies may encroach ten feet.

The Water Tower District Traffic Impact Study shows that there will be minor traffic impacts with Phase 60 to the surrounding road network. The recommendations from staff, are to adjust the intersection timing at Poplar Avenue at Shea Road and Bray Station Road, install signal phases, and extend the eastbound turn lane on Poplar Avenue west of Schilling Blvd. W. The BMA could require improvements to Poplar Avenue to comply with the Major Road Plan, including improving the right-of-way 54 feet from the centerline with an additional traffic lane/deceleration lane. The Town Attorney's opinion supports the developer paying reasonable portion since the property is adjacent to Poplar Avenue. Per the developer, the PD is explicit on improvement

EXHIBITS

1. PC Conditions of Approval (7/31/20)
2. DRC Conditions of Approval (7/31/20)
3. Applicant's cover letter (7/14/20)
4. Existing & Future Stand-Alone Apartment Development Memo (7/31/20)
5. Excerpt Schilling Farms PD Traditional Neighborhood Pattern (III.L.)
6. Schilling Farms Phase 60 Traffic Impact Study Executive Summary (12/10/18)
7. Storm Water Drainage Summary (4/1/20)
8. The Water Tower District Design Philosophy (5/22/20)
9. Building Transparency Matrix (7/14/20)
10. Building Design Score Matrix (7/14/20)
11. Excerpt from Design Guidelines Appendix IV: Supplemental Standards for Attached Dwellings
12. Schilling Farms PD Outline Plan Sheet 1
13. Preliminary Site Plan Package (7/14/20)
14. Color Preliminary Site Plan (1/15/20)
15. Graphic Material Board & Color Elevations (5/29/20)
16. Perspective Renderings (1/15/20)
17. Retail Building 4 Rendering (3/31/20)
18. Water Tower Rendering (3/31/20)

requirements and all those improvements have been completed. The need for a third lane is caused by an overall Town-wide traffic increase. They are willing to work with the Town on adding a deceleration lane and they would contribute their share of construction if not already improved.

Fisher Arnold prepared the grading and drainage report that concluded that all downstream drainage is adequate to convey fully developed flows for the development. The entire area is being graded and prepared for future development. All interior drainage drains directly to Nonconnah Creek without need for any permanent stormwater detention. A temporary detention pond is under construction at the northwest corner of Area 2 for use until the entire development is completed.

She reviewed the two motions, next steps for the applicants, and the conditions of approval as contained in the staff reports.

Hearing no questions, Chairman Cotton called the applicant forward to speak

Mr. Les Binkley, representative for the applicant, addressed the commissioners. He thanked the commissioners for hearing their application today and thanked staff for working with them on one of the most complicated neighborhoods in Collierville. He explained that this will be a very high end project and will draw large corporate offices along with their employees and consumers. It will attract the some of the highest rent demands in the area. He showed a short video which shows the design elevations of the project. Their tag line for this development is Live, Work, Play, which meshes into the Town's plan for its residents. It will have something to offer "For All of Us". They accept all of the conditions of approval that are contained in the staff report.

Chairman Cotton asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Alderman Worley called Mr. Michael Rogers with Fisher Arnold to the podium.

Mr. Michael Rogers, representative with Fisher Arnold addressed the commissioners.

Alderman Worley asked him about the drainage problems under the railroad that are near to this development.

Mr. Rogers explained that the drainage for this area is all downstream of that area. There was a drainage analysis done at the beginning of the development of Schilling Farms PD. There is a small corner that drains to the northwest side of Porter Farms and that has a detention pond. There was an erosion problem with that culvert at the railroad track at one time. Everything else flows directly into the Nonconnah Creek.

Alderman Worley made a comment to remind everyone that this planned development was granted approval of apartments a very long time ago and has entitlements.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton called for a motion.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Rozanski, and seconded, to approve the Preliminary Plat for Schilling Farms PD, Phase 65, subject to the conditions in Exhibit 1.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.

2. In the subdivision data chart, correct the side yard setback for non-residential to be 5 feet, not 10 feet.
3. Call out the 25-foot front yard setback on Lot 3.
4. Please be advised that the plat will still need to be filed for Final Approval before it is recorded.
5. At time of Final, all Public Utilities (Drainage, Sewer & Water) must be shown in the appropriate easements.
6. Prior to plat recording, please provide a 11 x 17 drawing showing the area (s.f.) of all public easements and r.o.w. dedicated with this plat.

Alderman Worley stated that he wanted to remind everyone that our Town Attorney, Mr. Nathan Bicks was on the phone via conference call. He explained that Mr. Bicks has been talking with the applicant, and the BMA will be making the decision about the road improvements on Poplar Avenue, and its future improvements.

Commissioner Given stated that for future reference the Town has previously granted approval for these apartments to be built.

Alderman Worley stated that the PC could turn it down because of the apartments, but would most likely be issued a lawsuit tomorrow. We are trying to make sure the development is built to the Town's standards because they have already been approved for these apartments to be built.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll call:

Johnson – yes, Rozanski – yes, Given – yes, Marshall – yes, Goddard – yes, Worley – yes, Cotton - yes.

Motion Approved.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton called for a motion.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Rozanski, and seconded, to recommend that the BMA approve the request for a Preliminary Site Plan for The Water Tower District Phase 1 (Schilling Farms PD, Phase 66) subject to the conditions in Exhibit 1.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
2. All streets shall be private until the BMA decides to accept any of them as public. Per the executed Development Agreement for Phase 60, "Principle Avenue will be a private drive and built to Town standards. The applicant will need to make a request for it to be public at some point in the future. At that time, the BMA will make the decision to accept it."
3. With the Final Site Plan, provide the alternative tree mitigation table with a drawdown for this phase.
4. In the footnotes below the Site Data Chart remove the reference to III.G. from the note regarding density as it refers to minimum open space not density.
5. In the Site Data Chart, in addition to the density based on all of Area 2, provide the density based on the current phase (16.29 acres/Lot 2).
6. On the Building Type Schedule on the Site Layout:
 - a. Change the first column heading to Building Type.
 - b. Change the third column heading to Building Number (or Building #).

7. Reconcile the total usable open space on the Site Layout (shown as 70,866 square feet) and the Overall Landscape Plan (shown as +89,793 square feet).
8. With the Final Site Plan, the following will be required in addition to all other requirements:
 - a. The alternative tree mitigation table with a drawdown for this phase.
 - b. On the Final Site Layout and Final Landscape Plan, show the location of ground mounted mechanical units for any building without a roof well for the RTUs.
 - c. On the Final Site Layout and Final Landscape Plan, provide a legend with clear symbols for each wall and fence type. Confirm there will be a knee wall between Buildings 22, 23, 24 and 25.
 - d. On the Final Water Plan, show the location of the backflow preventer(s). Include a symbol in the legend.
9. At time of Final, please show existing contours on the Existing Conditions sheet with a **Minimum 100'** overlap plus any areas running directly on to the property for which you have provided drainage basin ridgelines.
10. On the Preliminary Grading & Drainage Plan, at the time of Final, please provide design/details for the Retaining Wall.
11. At the time of Final, provide calcs. for each drainage basin.
12. At time of Final, please provide Typical Paving Sections for all streets.
13. At time of Final, P&P sheets will be required for all Public/Private Streets.
14. At time of Final, please provide a CAD file.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll:

Roll call:

Johnson – yes, Rozanski – yes, Given – yes, Marshall – yes, Goddard – yes, Worley – yes, Cotton - yes.

Motion Approved.

DD20-039 – Oakwood, Phase 2 – Request review and comments for a Sketch Plat for a 7-lot residential subdivision on 4.50 acres located at 262 and 276 East Poplar Avenue.

DD20-061 – Ordinance 2020-05 – Oakwood, Phase 2 – Request to rezone 2.14 acres from R-1: Low Density Residential to R-2A: Medium Density Residential, located east of the terminus of Ellawood Lane.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation. He explained that this new subdivision would be adjacent to the Oakwood Subdivision, which was created 1999. There are two houses on Poplar Avenue, which would remain. This new subdivision would have a net gain of 5 lots, and would be in the local historic overlay. He showed an aerial map of the area. He explained that the Phase 2 of Oakwood Subdivision would have a density of 2.37 dwelling units per acre (DUA) for just a portion where the five lots would be located. The density would be 1.56 DUA based on the entire seven-lot development, which includes the 2 R-1 lots already built on Poplar Avenue.

EXHIBITS

1. Cover Letter (6/23/20)
2. Grounds to Amend Zoning Map (7/31/20)
3. Ordinance 2020-05, with legal description and location map (7/31/20)
4. Consolidated Staff Comments (5/27/20) with applicant's responses
5. Downtown Small Area Plan Special Area #4
6. Traditional Neighborhood Place Type
7. Collierville 2040 Maximum Gross Residential Density Map
8. Oakwood, Final Plat (1999)
9. Oakwood, Phase 2 Aerial Photo (6/23/20)
10. Oakwood, Phase 2 Sketch Plat (6/23/20)
11. Comments from Neighbors (rec. 7/31/20)
12. Handouts from Attorney from Neighbors

The current Oakwood Subdivision built in 1999 has a street stub to the east for future extension. Oakwood has a density of 3.15 DUA for the 10 lots is zoned R-2: Medium Density Residential, fronting on Great Falls Cove and Ellawood Lane, and density is 2.04 DUA based upon the entire 11-lot development including the R-1 lot on Poplar Avenue. Although zoned R-2, records show that exceptions to Town Standards were granted to allow a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 80 feet.

The rezoning request is generally consistent with types and intensity of land uses anticipated by the Collierville 2040 plan. The density of Oakwood, Phase 2 will be 2.37 DUA for just the portion where the five lots would be located. The density would be 1.56 DUA based on the entire seven-lot development, which includes the two R-1 lots on Poplar Avenue. There are water and services available in the area and they would be adequate for the new lots.

He showed some photographs of the proposed area and the adjacent properties. Tree mitigation will have to be done, but a tree survey would come later in the review process. Extending the cul-de-sac for more than 600 feet means the five new homes must be “sprinkled”. There will not be any detention area, but the developer will have to have a storm management plan. He showed a comparison on the screen of the two subdivisions, and showed that all five lots in Phase 2 are larger than the smallest lot in Oakwood Subdivision of 1999. The traffic impact will be minimal with an estimated extra 48 new trips per day.

He reviewed the next steps for the applicant, the conditions of approval and the example motions contained in the staff report.

Chairman Cotton asked if there were any questions of staff.

Commissioner Goddard asked if it was clear back in 1999 when this stub street was developed that it was for future development.

Mr. Groce stated that this is clear on the plat that it is to be extended and it is clear that it is a public street.

Chairman Cotton called the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Rob Smith, property Owner, addressed the commissioners. He explained that in 1999, the precedence for this land was set when the Oakwood Subdivision was approved and built. All of this land was zoned R-1 originally, they took the back half out and rezoned it to R-2 and developed the subdivision like he is trying to do. The engineer who did this in 1999, is his engineer today. He designed this in 1999 and place the stub-out in for the future development with the Town’s approval so as not to land-lock the adjacent property. The precedence has been set and he does not see any problems with what he is proposing tonight. There have been concerns with it and they would like to keep as many trees as possible when they grade the property. The sizes of these homes will be bigger than the current homes on the adjacent property and the lots are bigger. The homes will comply with the Historic District Guidelines. He did not agree with the development proposal at Poplar Avenue and Burrows Road, because it was not consistent with the development in the area at that time. He has met with a lot of the property owners in the Oakwood Subdivision, and they have an issue with the R2-A zoning. He has tried to explain to them that their current zoning is more like R2-A, and his proposal meets the current bulk requirements for that zoning of R-2A, but that district didn’t exist in 1999. Their proposal meets every requirement for R-2 zoning, except for 1 lot whose width is 3 feet smaller than the minimum requirement for R-2.

Vice-Chairman Rozanski asked, if Lot 14 becomes a potential lot for drainage, is it still possible for the home to go on this lot.

Mr. Smith stated that it is.

Chairman Cotton called citizens forward to speak.

A discussion ensued regarding the request of the applicant, and the discussion that he has had with the current property owners in The Oakwood Subdivision. The applicant explained that he is just trying to finish the property as it was intended to be developed.

Mr. Brain Yoakum, attorney for Mr. and Mrs. Darren Yoder, addressed the commissioners. He explained that this is Mr. Smith's first attempt to rezone and develop a property and it has not proceeded very smoothly. Unfortunately, they have not heard from Mr. Smith until July 31, 2020, when he filed his response on behalf of his clients to the PC. They have spoken with Mr. Smith, however, his response to their questions was met with statement from him telling them all the things that they are saying are wrong. He has not addressed any of their concerns yet, and they have concerns about the detention area to be installed on Lot 14. He believes there are already considerable drainage issues happening in this area with the adjacent property owner's property facing Fletcher Road. They have submitted this information in their submittal of responses they have distributed to staff and the PC for their consideration. They have concerns about the water pressure issue which has been longstanding in this area as well, even though a booster pump was installed by Town years ago. They have an issue with the transition area. He feels that with cars being parked on the street, the area is tight for vehicles to get through. They would like to see a Traffic Impact Study. They do not believe that the developer has not proven or complied with the necessary grounds for amendment and those requirements are set forth as items 5 through 7 within the Grounds for Amendment to the Zoning Map. The Burrows Subdivision was a precedent for this request in that it was denied many times for their rezoning request from R-1 to R-2. They are willing to look a design for this property if it doesn't negatively impact the current property owners and would be a benefit to the community.

Mrs. Zoe Marshall, resident at 281 Fletcher Road, addressed the commissioners. She explained that they she was involved in the petition requesting that the stub street was left on Ellawood Lane, and the reason they asked for it to remain was because it gave them back access to their rear properties. That she was aware of, there were no plans there at that time for any type of subdivision. She does not believe that there were any thoughts to a subdivision being placed there, it was just left there so that they could access their rear property. Her property backs up to this property. She was shocked when she found out that Mr. Smith was proposing this development as he has never contacted her about his plans for this property. She already has erosion damage on her property, and there is already water damage and drainage issues in the area. She has submitted pictures of how the water drains and collects on her property causing erosion now. The Town is going to have to address this storm water drainage issue soon as it is going to undercut the sidewalk and road. She believes the plan is poorly laid out and the skinny lots are going to cause flooding on Fletcher Road.

Mrs. Annie Yoder, resident at 255 Ellawood Lane, addressed the commissioners. She explained that they are worried about the density, and they were not notified in advance of Mr. Smith's intentions. This is trying to put a square peg in a round hole. They feel their road is rather narrow and they have concerns about the children playing in the street and the roaming cats in the area. They will have their peaceful life disrupted by extra traffic and noise. Their attempt to rezone this property will cause them to now have a home seven feet off the back of their fence, peering into their back yard and so they have concerns about their privacy. Mr. Smith was never the developer of their subdivision and there was never a Master Plan developed to her knowledge. They were never asked about their thoughts of this new subdivision and she is asking the PC to deny this project as there are many people here tonight who oppose it.

Mrs. Beth Pope, resident at 232 E. Poplar Avenue, addressed the commissioners. She explained that she was shocked to see this development. She likes Dr. Creasy and she has talked with him previously about his plans and she told him she didn't think this would work in the Historic District. Her home is lots west of this proposal. If this goes through, is it just the beginning of the changing of R-1 and allow all kinds of more developments with homes around her? Are we going to continue to put more cars on the two-lane portion of the Historic District of Town? This is adding too much traffic in this area. She doesn't understand why we have to use every bit of greenspace in town, to build more homes. She has already spent more than \$20,000 to divert water off of her property in a responsible way. There is a water issue in this area now and adding more homes on that property is going to make it worse. She is asking the PC not to approve this request.

Mr. William Daniel, resident at 295 Skyline Trail, addressed the commissioners. He explained what is happening now with the water draining on his property and it is awful. It floods his property and mud is left sitting up against his fence after heavy rain. There is just a river of water flowing through his property when it rains. His water pressure is better since the Town put the water pump in, but adding more homes to this line may cause it to be worse again.

Mrs. Jennie Smith, resident at 302 Burrows Road, addressed the commissioners. She has resided in Collierville for 33 years, and has been a property owner on Burrows Road for 12 years. She explained that the intentions of Mr. Smith is good and he wants to do what is right. He has done due diligence, and he is here tonight open for suggestions, and is willing to listen to the opinions of the other property owners. It makes sense if you look at the map, that this is the intentions for the future development of this area for the rezoning request. She has reviewed the plan and it appears that Mr. Smith is trying to save as many trees as possible. She can attest to the traffic and drainage issues on Burrows Road, and she feels the water issues are a Collierville issue and not an issue of this development or its future development. She feels that this development being proposed tonight would be a benefit to the Town and would appreciate if the PC would consider approving it.

Mr. Bob Akers, resident at 275 Great Fall Road, addressed the commissioners. He is in opposition of this development. He feels that their subdivision is being used an entrance for this land locked piece of property. The additional traffic is going to create a real issue for the children who plan on this street. This proposed development was never designed to be a lead into their neighborhood. He feels the traffic will increase more than has been disclosed in the report. There are only a few streets in this area that the homeowners can use to travel to get out onto Poplar Avenue and it is very heavily used now. He would like for the PC to deny this request.

Mr. Kevin Sholl, resident at 257 Great Falls Road, addressed the commissioners. He explained that they moved here from California twelve years ago. He has a lot of respect for the character of Collierville and his concerns are the safety issues. There will be two cul de sacs very close together and there is going to be a very high density of asphalt due to the many homes places in a short area. This larger density of asphalt in the road, where their children play, will increase dramatically. He would rather not see an estimate of added traffic in the staff report, and would ask that the Town insist on a traffic study for the safety children of the neighborhood. He is in opposition of this project and asks that it be denied or deferred until a traffic study can be conducted.

Mr. Darrell Turner, resident at 242 E. Poplar Avenue, addressed the commissioners. He explained that he did have initial concerns that all the driveways in this new area were all going to be directly in front of his home. Mr. Smith has shown that this is not going to happen and there will not be any houses in front of Mr. Treadwell's home. There are no longer opposed to this development and they no longer object to the project and withdraw from the petition against it

Chairman Cotton reminded the commissioners and citizens, that the plan is merely a sketch plan to be reviewed and give feedback to the applicant on its design. The voting item before the commission this evening is the rezoning request.

Vice-Chairman Rozanski explained that he understands there is not much difference in the R-2 and R-2A zoning; however, he believes the drainage issues and the density on a 31-foot wide road of the plan seems a little much for the area. It does not leave them a lot of room for driveways and cars. He doesn't believe the new development will make things worse, but he would like to see that some of these issues have been addressed.

Commissioner Johnson stated that density is a bit much and he would like to see the developer address the drainage issues. He would like the developer and the Town to appease the residents who are there.

Alderman Worley asked if staff could give him info on the water pump that was installed by the Town.

Chief of Fire Prevention, Paul Witt, addressed the commissioners and stated that he has received confirmation from Mr. Mills at the Water Station that this pump was installed by the Town is good for another 10 years. Regarding the sprinkler systems that will be required in these new homes, the new Fire Codes say that they must be sprinkled and sprinkler systems need to be installed in the homes. This requirement is mandatory to help cover the response delay that might come if the Fire truck responding to a fire in that area is delayed because it is hard for them to travel down the road quickly.

A discussion ensued regarding whether or not the fire hydrants in that area are adequate. Chief Witt stated that Mr. Mills stated that the water pressure was good in that area now, but he would need more time to investigate the fire hydrants.

Mr. Wesley Ashworth, engineer for the project, addressed the commissioners. He explained that he has been in Collierville for 40 years and he was the engineer of record on the Park Hill and Oak Hill Subdivisions when they were approved. Everything was zoned R-1 in that area at that time and Park Hill was rezoned to R-2. Mike Russell was the developer for Oakwood Phase 1. When they did Oakwood Phase 1, they did not propose a stub street, it was required by the Town, and the property was rezoned to R-2. The adjacent property owners at that time of approval for Oakwood Phase 1 were against the R-2 zoning, but it was approved. As an engineer, he has a legal obligation not to make things worse. His job is to make sure that the development is built to Town Standards. They are going to leave as many trees as they can as they are an asset to the property.

Commissioner Marshall asked about the zoning they are requesting. She asked if they could build their development under the R-1 zoning.

Mr. Ashworth explained yes they could, but the lots would be required to be at least 15,000 square feet, but it would be difficult to sell those larger lots next to the R-2 zoning of the Oakwood Subdivision. This is the reason for their R2-A zoning request. Because of the size of the lots they are building next to.

Chairman Cotton stated that the rezoning request has a sketch plan with it and they have heard a lot of opposition against it tonight. He is concerned about being asked to rezone a piece of property without being shown all the issues have been addressed

Commissioner Johnson asked if this rezoning request is a show stopper for the project?

Mr. Ashworth stated yes.

A discussion ensued regarding the rezoning request and the area of the lots that it applies to, and the next step for the applicant if this request is approved. The applicant would then need to submit a Preliminary Plat for approval based on the comments that he heard tonight. The applicant can ask for a deferral.

Mr. Ashworth stated that they do not want to ask for a deferral, but they could make a request for an R-2 zoning. There is only a 3 foot difference.

Mr. Smith stated that he would like for the PC to take a vote based on their request for rezoning to R2-A.

Motion by Commissioner Goddard, and seconded, to recommend approval of Ordinance 2020-05 (Exhibit 3) to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll call:

Johnson – no, Rozanski – no, Given – no, Marshall – no, Goddard – yes, Worley – no, Cotton - no.

Motion failed.

DD19-066 – Georgetown PD (formerly known as Mt. Pleasant Trace PD) – Request approval of Preliminary Subdivision Plat for 64 single family residential lots on 26.57 acres located on Mt. Pleasant Road near its intersection with Progress Road.

Mr. Scott Henninger gave the staff presentation. He explained that The Mt. Pleasant Trace Planned Development was originally approved in 2008. A final plat was approved, but a development agreement was never executed and the final plat was never recorded. The records are unclear as to whether a waiver of road improvement to Mt. Pleasant Road was granted in 2008. On December 9, 2019 the BMA approved Resolution 2019-41, which created an Outline Plan that addressed unresolved procedural requirements from 2008, allows the Alternative Tree Mitigation ratio of 14 trees per acre, and clarifies the process to decide what improvements are needed. A minor PD amendment is pending administratively which will modify the landscape plate along Mt. Pleasant Road.

- | EXHIBITS | |
|----------|---|
| 1. | Conditions of Approval (7/31/20) |
| 2. | Applicant's Cover Letter including request for right-of-way waivers (7/13/20) |
| 3. | Traffic Study Excerpt (dated 9/07/18) |
| 4. | Preliminary Subdivision Plat (7/13/20) |
| 5. | Tree Protection, Mitigation, & Open Space Landscape Exhibits (7/13/20) |
| 6. | Revised Mt. Pleasant Rd. Landscape Plate |
| 7. | Major Road Plan Excerpt (2018) |
| 8. | Existing Land Use (2019) |
| 9. | 2040 Place Types (2020) |

Open space plans will be reviewed by the DRC next week. There is 7.59 acres of open space or 29% of the land area. Some of the existing trees will remain in the common open spaces.

The setbacks match the requirement of the PD. The front setback is 25 feet, the rear setback is 20 feet. The side setbacks will total 16 feet with no side less than 6 feet. The applicant will be utilizing a 31-foot alternate right-of-way and a 9.5-foot pedestrian/utility easement will be included. Porches may encroach, but not closer than 20 feet from the curb.

A trail will run through preserved trees in Common Open space A. The frontage of Mt. Pleasant Road will primarily fall within Common Open Space B, and will consist of entrance features, a 6-foot masonry wall, street trees, and upright evergreen shrubs.

Common Open Space C contains a ditch and a retaining wall behind lots 58 through 61 to help preserve two large Oak Trees. The primary amenities will be located within Common Open Space D.

Mr. Groce explained the Postmaster is now requiring mail kiosks to be built in new Planned Developments. Community mailboxes now have to be placed in an area somewhere in the development in order to reduce costs for the USPS. You will see these in future plans as the USPS does not want to deliver mail to individual homes any longer.

Traffic impacts from the 64 single family houses should be minimal, but how Mt. Pleasant Road is improved could have long lasting consequences for the future developments in this area. The cover letter indicates the applicant's request for a waiver from providing additional right-of-way, and additional improvements to Mt. Pleasant Road from what their plans show. The road is currently a rural section with a 50-foot right-of-way.

The Major Road Plan indicates Mt. Pleasant Road as a Minor Collector requiring a 72 right-of-way intended to allow for a 4-lane undivided roadway. Mt. Pleasant Road's proximity to SR385 could limit its ability to be widened to the south. The Traffic Study indicates that the 64 lots will generate 690 daily vehicle trips per day. The study also indicates that the existing 2-lane road has the capacity to handle traffic, both existing and the projected traffic generated from the development.

The applicant plans to keep Mt. Pleasant Road a 2 lane road but add curbs, gutters and sidewalk. The Outline Plan was amended in December 2019 by the BMA to say Mt. Pleasant Road shall be constructed and improved per the Town of Collierville Major Road Plan unless otherwise approved by the PC. Regardless of actions in 2008, the statement in the Outline Plan explains what is required for Mt. Pleasant Road and the process to deviate from the Major Road Plan.

The PC's role is to determine the needed right-of-way. Per the subdivision regulations, the BMA will decide the needed road improvement with the development agreement. To approve the right-of-way wavier requested by the applicant, the PC will need to delete or modify condition of approval number 3.

The Town is planning to comprehensively update all or portions of the Major Road Plan, but the timing and the scope of this project has not been decided. A deferral of this application is appropriate until an amendment to the Major Road Plan is submitted by the applicant, allowing staff and the PC an opportunity to look at the long term implications of deviating from the Major Road Plan. Mt. Pleasant Road from Keough Road to Profess Road has significant growth potential and such uses would generate traffic.

Mr. Groce explained that this area has growth potential and the Major Road Plan is the formal way to plan what roads are needed and how wide they need to be. A lot of information is taken in to account, and the type of road is decided based on those factors. Currently there is a 4-lane road shown to be in this area, and the applicant has stated in their cover letter that a 4-lane road was decided in 2008 not to be needed. Staff could not find any kind of Major Road Plan amendment to this statement, or that there was any final determination about this part of the roadway. If you approve this wavier tonight, this will set the tone for this area and this will have an impact on the Major Road Plan. Staff has suggested to the applicant to apply for a Major Road Plan amendment. The applicant's representative who conducted the Traffic Study is here tonight and he was involved in the plan 20 years ago. The Traditional Neighborhood plan may provide for single family houses on those vacant tracts. We may see a high density development in this area, and if that happens it will impact this

area and we need to look at what is needed. The Major Road Plan is a document of the PC and you need to make sure this talked about and what is going to happen in the area in the future.

Mr. Henninger reviewed elevation renderings of the road section of Mt. Pleasant Road as a 4-lane road. Per the Engineering Division, they would need the applicant to dedicate an additional 11 feet of right-of-way for the widening of Mt. Pleasant Road, with a possible 14 additional feet of roadway to comply with the Road Plan. Review of the Construction Drawings will address the storm water requirements for the subdivision.

The site drains primarily to a low point near the northeast corner where a detention basin will be located. A drainage easement will carry runoff from the basin eastward towards Progress Road. A box culvert carries existing drainage under Mt. Pleasant Road into the site where it quickly exits the site near the southeast corner. During the development agreement process, the Engineering Division will review the plans to ensure adequate capacity for storm water.

The major issue is whether the right-of-way for a 4-lane road section of Mt. Pleasant Road is needed or if the requested 2-lane section is appropriate.

He reviewed the next steps for the applicant, the conditions of approval and the motion contained in the staff report.

Alderman Worley stated that he was involved with this project back when he was on the PC. In 2008, how many lanes were shown on their plans at that time.

Mr. Henninger stated that it was shown as a 50-foot right-of-way on the plat. The Final Plat was approved, but was never recorded. Staff is not sure what the request was, and what was finally approved because the record is not clear.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman Cotton called the applicant forward.

Mr. Mark Davis, representative for the applicant, addressed the commissioners. He explained that they are in agreement with all of the conditions except they do not agree with the additional right-of-way for the widening of Mt. Pleasant Road. They began work on this project in 2006. It had the same road and lot configuration that is submitted today. They received approval for the rezoning, the Planned Development, the Plat, and they were issued a final development agreement that was ready for execution by Mr. Denley. All of this had gone through numerous staff reviews, and completely approved by The Town. It was ready for the Town's Engineer signature subject to the execution of the development agreement and the fees being paid. The same issue regarding the right-of-way came up then. The MPO and Major Road Plan showed this to be a 4-lane road. In 2006, as part of the approval process, they were required to provide a traffic study. Mr. James Collins with Kimley-Horn provided this information and concluded that a 4-lane road was not warranted, justified or needed. This was presented at the public hearings and they requested a waiver based on the study. The request was approved as evidenced by the construction plans and the plat that was approved and reviewed by staff, having no right-of-way dedication shown on those plans. Had it been an issue at that time, he doesn't think that they would have gotten a development agreement with those plans ready to be signed by the Town's Engineer. This was all based on their expert's traffic study. Because of the economic conditions in 2009, the development agreement never got executed and the project was shelved. In 2019, they revived the plan and hired Mr. Collins again to create a new traffic study.

Mr. James Collins, traffic engineer, addressed the commissioners. He explained that the traffic study done before shows the traffic out there works great. When all that undeveloped property develops, it will generate

around 6,000 trips. Traffic will be splitting and going in different directions. Half of those trips generated will be going different ways and there are easier ways to get there from one area to another area in Town, rather than using this particular area. The capacity for a 2 lane road is about 5200 cars per day. It will be running at about 60% of its capacity. His approach would be to put in a 2 lane roadway, and as some of the properties develop, except at a few intersections. In the peak of the rush hour there will be 5 cars going through an intersection every minute. Some will be going one direction and some will be going the other direction. There is roughly a 15 second gap between each car. There should be plenty of gaps along the roadway to allow the traffic to do that. There may need to be left turn lanes at some of the entrances, but he would not suggest that you build a 3-lane section for the entire stretch of roadway because you will have a lane of asphalt not being used and needed to be maintained. Each individual development in the future will need to be determined on whether or not it needs to have a left hand turning lane added.

Alderman Worley stated that he agrees we don't need four lanes out there now. He needs to decide 2 or 3 lanes today. He asked Mr. Groce how long it takes to make a Major Road Plan change.

Mr. Groce explained that it could be on the next PC meeting agenda if it is warranted. Staff has discussed this situation and how to correct it, but staff does not have a good data or assumptions to back this decision up right now. He has met with the Engineering Division and not knowing right now what the numbers will be in the future, it was the assumption that a third lane would be the easier fix to address the future development.

Alderman Worley stated that he feels that the BMA would like to not pave as much road as we have to, and maintain it. He thinks asking them to pave two lanes and asking them to dedicate the right-of-way, and then let the BMA decide whether they pay the Town for the future third lane, the Town can hold their money in reserve to use when the time comes. We can use that money on their project, when it is needed, or on another current project.

Vice-Chairman Rozanski stated that he has concerns about needing that extra lane, and leans towards asking them for the right-of-way now. If we don't get that now, we will never get it. Two lanes are probably okay now, but also looking at a bike lane is a great option.

Commissioner Goddard stated that he feels they should ask for the right-of-way dedication and the fees-in-lieu-of for the future construction of the third lane.

A discussion ensued regarding how to word the condition of approval to make this happen in the motion.

Mr. W. H. Porter, design engineer for the project, addressed the commissioners. He explained that if the road needed three lanes, the traffic report would have said that. They have plans to add 3 feet of pavement to the 12-foot width of the pavement out there now, which is the bike lane for that road. The three lanes are going to be critical at the intersections. He likes the idea of looking at each development as they come in and asking them to develop the turn lanes associated with their projects. Right now, their project is proposing the pavement for the bike lane on their side of the road.

A discussion ensued regarding the distance between the fence and the back of the curb of their development. Mr. Henninger explained that there should be 28 feet from the right-of-way to the back of the first property lines.

Mr. Davis stated that he and Mr. Grant discussed adding the third lane and it will not hurt the project, and will not cause them any delays. They will need to tweak some of the landscaping in that area, but they can do this

as long as it is just a dedication. The BMA will decide on the improvements. They would agree to add the twelve feet.

Alderman Worley asked Mr. Cravens if staff was okay with this being three lanes in lieu of four.

Mr. Jay Cravens explained that stated yes, that staff has talked about this today. If a Major Road Plan amendment needs to be made, the PC will need to hear that information at the next meeting. The condition of approval from staff is already in place and should cover the issue.

A discussion ensued regarding how to amend the condition of approval number 3.

Motion by Alderman Worley, and seconded, to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plat (Exhibit 4) for Georgetown PD (formerly known as Mt. Pleasant Trace PD), subject to the Conditions in Exhibit 1.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1) This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
- 2) Label the pedestrian easement along Mt. Pleasant Road to clearly delineate it from other lines. Note that it is for public use but will be maintained by the Homeowners Association.
- 3) Dedicate an additional 11 feet of right-of-way for the widening of Mt. Pleasant Road. Provide 14 additional feet of roadway, unless the road improvements are waived by the BMA to decide or fees in lieu of construction are required. If additional right-of-way is required:
 - i) Adjust the grass strip dimension in both the subdivision construction drawings and the PD Outline Plan Landscape Plate (currently being amended by a minor PD amendment).
 - ii) Update the Data Table on the Subdivision Plat.
- 4) The following revisions shall be made to the Final Plat prior to recording:
 - a) Prior to plat recording, provide a 11 x 17 drawing showing the area (s.f.) of all public easements and r.o.w. dedicated with the plat.
 - b) PC approval of the Final Plat is required before it is recorded. With the Final Plat application, provide written responses stating how each Preliminary Plat condition has been addressed.
 - c) The Min. F.F.E.s should be to the nearest ½ foot. There are still a couple that were not revised.
 - d) Provide the As-Built topo. The Min. F.F.E.s will be reviewed once the As-Built topo is submitted.
 - e) Off-Site Esmts. – These must be recorded prior to the Development Agreement being prepared.
 - f) The lots are pretty cluttered with information. Do not show the Side Setbacks on the lots. These can be covered in the Site Data Table and a note. Trim the standard Util. Esmts. from around the text.
 - g) Add the distance to the Front and Rear Setback labels in the drawing.
 - h) According to note #16, there are not 5' Util. Esmts. on lots that have Drainage Esmts. You have Util. Esmts. shown in the Drainage Esmts. on the lots. Revise this.
 - i) On the Typical Section for Mt. Pleasant, you are showing a 28-foot Ped. Esmt. This needs to be shown and labeled on the plat. It is shown but needs to be labeled.
 - j) A copy of the MLGW address assignment must be submitted to the Engineering Dept. Street names are approved by MLGW.
 - k) Street Signs must be installed before the plat is recorded. Please contact the Engineering Inspector and the Town's Sign Shop before installation to verify that all signage meets the current requirements.
 - l) Provide a CAD file.

Mr. Keith Grant, future property owner of the project, addressed the commissioners. He explained that the dedication of the right-of-way of 11 feet is already in condition of approval number 3. They would like to see the next sentence struck as they should not have to provide an additional 14 feet of roadway. There are already adding 3 feet of pavement.

A discussion ensued regarding also changing the next sentence to say, "The additional right-of-way requires..."

Mr. Cravens stated that he feels the request should be tabled until staff has a chance to discuss this further with the applicant and is able to give the PC the necessary information they need to make a proper decision.

Mr. Davis explained that they are in agreement with the PC's decision to amend the condition of approval number 3 and it has been discussed and they would like to take it to a vote tonight. Everyone is in agreement with the 11-feet of dedication of the right-of-way. Let the BMA decide what is appropriate to make this happen regarding the additional right-of-way.

Alderman Worley accepted the friendly amendment to his motion to change condition of approval number 3 as requested, by striking the second sentence in number 3. Change the next sentence to say, "The additional right-of-way requires:". The updated conditions would read as follows:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 5) This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
- 6) Label the pedestrian easement along Mt. Pleasant Road to clearly delineate it from other lines. Note that it is for public use but will be maintained by the Homeowners Association.
- 7) Dedicate an additional 11 feet of right-of-way for the widening of Mt. Pleasant Road. ~~Provide 14 additional feet of roadway, unless the road improvements are waived by the BMA to decide or fees in lieu of construction are required.~~ The additional right-of-way requires:
 - i) Adjust the grass strip dimension in both the subdivision construction drawings and the PD Outline Plan Landscape Plate (currently being amended by a minor PD amendment).
 - ii) Update the Data Table on the Subdivision Plat.
- 8) The following revisions shall be made to the Final Plat prior to recording:
 - m) Prior to plat recording, provide a 11 x 17 drawing showing the area (s.f.) of all public easements and r.o.w. dedicated with the plat.
 - n) PC approval of the Final Plat is required before it is recorded. With the Final Plat application, provide written responses stating how each Preliminary Plat condition has been addressed.
 - o) The Min. F.F.E.s should be to the nearest ½ foot. There are still a couple that were not revised.
 - p) Provide the As-Built topo. The Min. F.F.E.s will be reviewed once the As-Built topo is submitted.
 - q) Off-Site Esmts. – These must be recorded prior to the Development Agreement being prepared.
 - r) The lots are pretty cluttered with information. Do not show the Side Setbacks on the lots. These can be covered in the Site Data Table and a note. Trim the standard Util. Esmts. from around the text.
 - s) Add the distance to the Front and Rear Setback labels in the drawing.
 - t) According to note #16, there are not 5' Util. Esmts. on lots that have Drainage Esmts. You have Util. Esmts. shown in the Drainage Esmts. on the lots. Revise this.
 - u) On the Typical Section for Mt. Pleasant, you are showing a 28-foot Ped. Esmt. This needs to be shown and labeled on the plat. It is shown but needs to be labeled.
 - v) A copy of the MLGW address assignment must be submitted to the Engineering Dept. Street names are approved by MLGW.

w) Street Signs must be installed before the plat is recorded. Please contact the Engineering Inspector and the Town's Sign Shop before installation to verify that all signage meets the current requirements.
Provide a CAD file

Mr. Bicks, the Town Attorney, stated that he was agreeable with the concept with the motion, he just needs to hear it verbally.

Vice-Chairman Rozanski stated that the last sentence should say, "The additional right-of-way requires:".

Alderman Worley, and the second, agreed to the changes as stated.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Cotton asked Mrs. Michael to call the roll.

Roll call:

Johnson – yes, Rozanski – yes, Given – yes, Marshall – yes, Goddard – yes, Worley – yes, Cotton - yes.

Motion Approved.

Other Business:

Chairman Cotton asked if there was any Other Business.

Mr. Groce explained that the 2nd Quarter Development Activity Map was updated and released the other day. He reviewed the applications the PC may be seeing at its meetings over the next few months.

Staff will be working on some training videos in the next month so that the commissioners can complete their four hours of Continuing Education that is required by the state. The training will mostly focus on local planning processes, such as site plans, subdivisions, etc.

Hearing no further business, Chairman Cotton adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Secretary, Commissioner Jeremy Given